

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

TROOPER 1, \* Case No. 22-CV-00893 (LDH)  
\*  
Plaintiff, \* Brooklyn, New York  
\* August 2, 2022  
v. \*  
\*  
NEW YORK STATE POLICE, et al., \*  
\*  
Defendants. \*  
\*  
\* \* \* \* \*

TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR STATUS CONFERENCE  
BEFORE THE HONORABLE TARYN A. MERKL  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: JOHN S. CRAIN, ESQ.  
VALDI LICUL, ESQ.  
Wigdor, LLP  
85 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10003

For Defendant,  
New York State Police: JOSHUA STEELE, ESQ.  
Harris Beach, PLLC  
99 Garnsey Road  
Pittsford, NY 14534

For Defendant, Former  
Governor Andrew Cuomo: RITA M. GLAVIN, ESQ.  
MICHAELINE WRIGHT, ESQ.  
Glavin, PLLC  
156 W. 56th Street, Ste 2004  
New York, NY 10019

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording,  
transcript produced by transcription service.

APPEARANCES (Cont'd)

For Defendant, Former  
Governor, Andrew Cuomo:

THERESA TRZASKOMA, ESQ.  
Sher Tremonte, LLP  
90 Broad Street  
New York, NY 10004

For Defendants, Melissa  
DeRosa and Richard  
Azzopardi:

ELKAN ABRAMOWITZ, ESQ.  
RACHEL FLEIG-GOLDSTEIN, ESQ.  
Morvillo, Abramowitz, Grand,  
Iason & Boherer, P.C.  
565 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10017

1 (Proceedings commenced at 2:03 p.m.)

2 THE CLERK: This is civil cause for a status  
3 conference, docket 22-CV-893, Trooper 1 versus New York State  
4 Police, et al.

5 Before asking the parties to state their  
6 appearance, I would like to note the following:

7 Persons granted remote access to proceedings are  
8 reminded of the general prohibition against photographing,  
9 recording and re-broadcasting of court proceedings.

10 Violation of these prohibitions may result in sanctions,  
11 including removal of court-issued media credentials,  
12 restricted entry to future hearings, denial of entry to  
13 future hearings, or any other sanctions deemed necessary by  
14 the Court.

15 Will the parties please state their appearances for  
16 the record, starting with the plaintiff.

17 MR. LICUL: Valdi Licul, Wigdor, LLP, for the  
18 plaintiff, Trooper 1.

19 MR. CRAIN: John Crain from Wigdor, LLP, also for  
20 Trooper 1.

21 MS. TRZASKOMA: Good afternoon. Theresa Trzaskoma  
22 from Sher Tremonte on behalf of former Governor Cuomo.

23 MS. GLAVIN: And Rita Glavin is also here as well  
24 for Governor Cuomo.

25 THE COURT: And for the State Police?

1                   MR. STEELE: Joshua Steele, from Harris Beach, for  
2 the State Police.

3                   THE COURT: Thank you.

4                   And for Ms. DeRosa and Mr. Azzopardi?

5                   MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Elkan Abramowitz and Rachel Fleig-  
6 Goldstein for the Defendants DeRosa and Azzopardi. Good  
7 afternoon.

8                   THE COURT: Good afternoon to all of you. And  
9 thank you for hopping on the conference on reasonably short  
10 notice.

11                  We were last together for the initial conference on  
12 June 6th when we set a schedule for discovery. And at that  
13 time, I noted that on that very day Mr. Azzopardi and Ms.  
14 DeRosa had filed a pre-motion conference letter to -- seeking  
15 to stay discovery pending resolution of a motion to dismiss.

16                  At that juncture, that motion had not yet been  
17 referred to me so I did not take it up. I thought it would  
18 probably be handled in connection with the motion to dismiss  
19 scheduling being handled by Judge DeArcy Hall.

20                  We've since been advised by Judge DeArcy Hall's  
21 chambers that she'd prefer that we address it because it  
22 pertains to discovery, so that is the reason we scheduled the  
23 conference. And because it's non-dispositive, she didn't do  
24 a formal referral order, but that is her preference that we  
25 take it up.

1                   So we're here today to understand where things are  
2 with regard to the discovery process thus far and whether or  
3 not you've been able to work anything out with regard to  
4 partial production or any type of a stay, or I'll hear you on  
5 the merits if there has been no decision made or no  
6 resolution reached to work out some accommodation.

7                   So since it is your motion, Mr. Abramowitz, would  
8 you like to start?

9                   MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.

10                  Yes. Your Honor is correct that on June 6th we did  
11 request a motion conference for a stay as to the defendants  
12 as a party and DeRosa, largely because we believe the motion  
13 to dismiss, which has already been submitted, not filed yet,  
14 submitted to the Court will be dispositive. It is a  
15 meritorious motion. It is not a routine motion.

16                  The allegations against both Ms. DeRosa and Mr.  
17 Azzopardi in connection with the overall allegations are  
18 thin, at best, in our view.

19                  In any event, the motion will be fully submitted by  
20 August 30th.

21                  In the interim, rather than having Ms. DeRosa and  
22 Mr. Azzopardi go to the expense of searching and making  
23 forensic searches of their electronic equipment, we have  
24 offered the plaintiff to give them all the materials that  
25 both Ms. DeRosa and Mr. Azzopardi have submitted to the

1           Attorney General and to the Assembly in connection with the  
2 investigation of this very matter.

3           We certainly think that that would be a good  
4 compromise to take us to the August 30th deadline for the  
5 submission of the whole motion where we believe we have  
6 raised meritorious claims for dismissal.

7           THE COURT: All right. And, Mr. Licul, are you  
8 taking the lead today? Is that correct?

9           MR. LICUL: I am. Thank you, Your Honor.

10           THE COURT: Would you like to respond?

11           MR. LICUL: I would.

12           And before I respond substantively to Mr.  
13 Abramowitz, I'd just like to give you an update on where we  
14 are in the discovery process. I think that was one of your  
15 questions.

16           The parties exchanged, the parties, meaning the  
17 State Police, our client, and former Governor Cuomo, have  
18 exchanged initial disclosures and discovery requests. And in  
19 the next couple of weeks, we will be responding to each  
20 others' requests. So that's where we are in the discovery  
21 process.

22           And I think, in accordance with Your Honor's  
23 original order, that's sort of what we -- what you termed  
24 phase one discovery will be complete as to all of the parties  
25 except for Ms. DeRosa and Mr. Azzopardi. So the only sort of

1 outliers here will be the two of them.

2 With respect to the merits, I don't know, Your  
3 Honor, how deeply you want me to go into the merits, but we  
4 do not believe that this motion has any merit.

5 Under the state and city laws, individuals are  
6 liable if they participate. If they don't take sufficient  
7 remedial action, they can be primarily liable. They can be  
8 liable as aiders and abettors for assisting or making the  
9 harassment happen.

10 That's the allegation against Ms. DeRosa. Her  
11 claim that she did not know is a factual issue that at best  
12 can be decided on summary judgment, certainly not on a motion  
13 to dismiss.

14 As far as the retaliation, under those laws, the  
15 retaliation standard is broad. It prohibits retaliating  
16 against anyone for engaging in protected activity.

17 Here, Trooper 1 engaged in numerous instances of  
18 protected activity. She participated in an Attorney General  
19 investigation, gave testimony complaining about harassment.

20 She sent -- she hired a lawyer and sent a demand  
21 letter. That is also protected activity. And she also filed  
22 suit, which is quintessential protected activity. And for  
23 that, she was then retaliated against by being accused of a  
24 crime, by being accused of being an extortionist.

25 And the standard under these laws is whether it

1       would make a reasonable person or dissuade a reasonable  
2       person for complaining. And certainly that is at best a  
3       factual matter as to whether or not a reasonable person would  
4       be dissuaded from complaining and asserting her rights after  
5       being called an extortionist and being threatened with  
6       criminal prosecution.

7                  As to the non-substantive issues, we don't think  
8       that a stay makes any sense. Certainly there's no stay --  
9       there's no automatic stay and it's a pretty high bar. And in  
10      this case it makes even less sense.

11                 Putting aside the merits of the motion, even if the  
12      motion is granted, which we advocate should not happen, but  
13      even if it is, Ms. DeRosa and Mr. Azzopardi will be non-party  
14      witnesses. They will be subpoenaed to give testimony. They  
15      will be subpoenaed to give information.

16                 In other words, the stay will not achieve anything.  
17      It will just gum up the process.

18                 As far as the undue burden, the only burden that  
19      they've pointed to is some type of expensive forensic  
20      examination.

21                 But the cases are pretty clear that if you want to  
22      argue that, you have to put some meat on those bones and  
23      explain what that -- what that would entail. I mean, it  
24      could entail something simply just looking through someone's  
25      phone or emails.

1                   And if it is a forensic, an outside forensic  
2 review, then as in the cases that we cited in our brief there  
3 has to be some specific information. You know, how much will  
4 it cost? How long will it take? What is the burden? Just  
5 routine review of emails or text messages is not a burden.

6                   And, again, so for those reasons, and to the extent  
7 I missed any of the reasons in our letter, we think that the  
8 -- we respectfully request that the motion for a stay be  
9 denied.

10                  THE COURT: Well --

11                  MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Your Honor, may I be heard for a  
12 moment?

13                  THE COURT: Yes. I just have one follow-up --

14                  MR. ABRAMOWITZ: I don't --

15                  THE COURT: Hold on. I just have a quick follow-up  
16 question to Mr. Licul.

17                  So are you requesting a forensic review of those  
18 phones, yes or no?

19                  MR. LICUL: We have not requested it, no. We're  
20 just asking for responsive documents, responsive information,  
21 whether in paper or electronic format. We've not  
22 specifically requested a forensic review.

23                  THE COURT: Okay. Now back to you, Mr. Abramowitz.

24                  MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Your Honor, I don't think this is  
25 the place for us to be arguing the motion to dismiss.

1                   But needless to say, we set forth in our original  
2 letter on June 6th all the reasons why plaintiff's claims for  
3 retaliation would not apply to Ms. DeRosa and Mr. Azzopardi  
4 since they were no longer employees of the government at the  
5 time of the alleged conduct.

6                   But as I said, I don't think this is the place to  
7 have this argument. It will be submitted by August 30th as I  
8 indicated.

9                   I believe that the plaintiff will get sufficient  
10 information, an enormous amount of material, that had been  
11 produced to the Assembly and to the Attorney General as per  
12 our offer pending the motion's decision.

13                   I think that it's not fair to make us go through  
14 the burden of having to go through our files for discovery at  
15 this stage if the motion is going to be decided reasonably  
16 quickly.

17                   So I reiterate the request that the stay of  
18 discovery beyond our offer of compromise be employed.

19                   THE COURT: Well, wouldn't you agree though with  
20 Mr. Licul, Mr. Abramowitz, that Ms. DeRosa's knowledge as to  
21 whether or not the harassment's going on is a question of  
22 fact?

23                   MR. ABRAMOWITZ: It may be a question of fact if --  
24 but in the context of this question of her knowledge it may  
25 be irrelevant. So that's why I'm urging you to please wait,

1       abide the submission and the arguing of the motion to  
2       dismiss. If she's not an employee of the government at the  
3       time, it may be totally irrelevant.

4                     THE COURT: I hear you with regard to the  
5       retaliation claim. That's not my question.

6                     My claim's to the harassment allegation. Isn't it  
7       true that whether or not she knew it was going on is a  
8       question of fact?

9                     MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Well, that would be a question of  
10      fact, Your Honor.

11                    THE COURT: Yes. That's my concern.

12                   And my concern also is that the motion,  
13       unfortunately due to, you know, various factors that all the  
14       judges here are contending with, could take quite a while to  
15       decide. So I think what we should do is proceed in a sort of  
16       cautious fashion.

17                   I'm not going to formally stay discovery based on  
18       the fact that I do think there are questions of fact inherent  
19       in the questions that are outlined in the papers.

20                   My reaction to the issue of whether or not Ms.  
21       DeRosa had knowledge of harassment was very much to question  
22       whether that was an issue of fact that would properly be  
23       resolved on a motion to dismiss. Perhaps it will be.

24                   So what I'm proposing is that we start some  
25       discovery, but we don't get to forensic reviews, depositions,

1 expert practice, the very intensive and time consuming and  
2 costly things that a party should not have to incur if they  
3 are not going to remain a party.

4                   But I am uncomfortable staying discovery completely  
5 for an indefinite period of time given the very significant  
6 possibility that at least one of plaintiff's claims may make  
7 it through with -- I shouldn't say one of the claims, one of  
8 the group of claims.

9                   If the harassment claim makes it through under  
10 Title 7, it will likely also make it through under state law  
11 and city claims, if there is a city claim, and you have to  
12 double check the complaint.

13                   So in that event, I don't think an indefinite stay  
14 is necessarily warranted given the scope of the motion that's  
15 anticipated.

16                   But I do think we should work out a compromise  
17 along the lines of what Mr. Abramowitz is suggesting.

18                   And so what I would prefer to do is have Mr.  
19 Abramowitz's clients produce the information that was  
20 prepared for the Assembly and for the Attorney General's  
21 investigation, and, you know, we can sort of stage things.

22                   What would you propose, Mr. Abramowitz, if we start  
23 in a staged manner?

24                   MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Well, I'd propose that we furnish  
25 the material that we've alluded to and then have further

1 discussions with plaintiff's counsel as to what more he would  
2 need and how we would go about getting it to him.

3 We want to cooperate with him without incurring the  
4 expense of doing unnecessary discovery if we're not going to  
5 be a party.

6 THE COURT: Right.

7 MR. ABRAMOWITZ: So that I think that if we have  
8 these discussions, we can always try to come back to Your  
9 Honor if we're running into an impasse. But I think we  
10 intend to be reasonable.

11 There was a lot of material that was produced and I  
12 think it may be sufficient for the plaintiff for the time  
13 being. And if not, and if we run into obstacles, we can  
14 always ask to come back to you.

15 THE COURT: Mr. Licul, what do you think about that  
16 proposal?

17 MR. LICUL: I think that -- well, I will stick to  
18 my original position.

19 But in terms of a compromise, to the extent there  
20 needs to be a compromise, I would say that the only thing  
21 that should be stayed -- and that would be temporarily  
22 because we don't know how long the motion is going to take --  
23 and then that of any forensic review.

24 But certainly it doesn't seem burdensome for either  
25 of those two defendants to respond to our interrogatories, to

1           respond to our document requests and that very well may be  
2           just turning over to us the things that they turned over to  
3           the AG's Office. But it may be a little bit broader. But it  
4           doesn't seem that that's unduly burdensome. And it would be  
5           the same thing that we would ask for in a proper subpoena.

6           I don't think we should necessarily put off their  
7           depositions. They would be deposed as non-parties in this  
8           case also.

9           So to the extent the one specific thing that they  
10          have argued would be burdensome in a forensic review, then  
11          perhaps (indiscernible) we should put off.

12           THE COURT: Mr. Abramowitz?

13           MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Interrogatories would be time  
14          consuming, Your Honor, and expensive.

15           I urge Your Honor to let us try to compromise. And  
16          whatever we've given to the Assembly and to the Attorney  
17          General, and let's see where we are, whether the plaintiff  
18          will be satisfied with that during the pendency of the  
19          motion.

20           I think everything else is going to incur expense  
21          for the clients that may not be necessary.

22           THE COURT: So, Mr. Licul, you say it's not  
23          burdensome to respond to interrogatories and document  
24          requests, but I'm familiar with the standard of work of Mr.  
25          Abramowitz's firm and I assure you it's going to be a

1                   tremendous amount of work for them to formally respond to  
2                   those in a formal manner.

3                   I think that starting with this first production  
4                   may well answer 99 percent of what you're looking for in  
5                   terms of document requests and information.

6                   And then I think you should meet and confer and  
7                   discuss what else is out there before we order a response on  
8                   interrogatories and document requests.

9                   Because even if the case is substantially narrowed,  
10                  that could change the burden that the plaintiff and  
11                  defendants have to provide, you know, the information and the  
12                  scope of what would be, you know, responsive.

13                  So I am going to "formally," quote/unquote, "deny  
14                  the request for an indefinite stay."

15                  And in lieu of a formal adherence to the discovery  
16                  schedule by these two defendants, I'm going to request that  
17                  the parties meet and confer and try to work out an  
18                  accommodation to, you know, reasonably provide the  
19                  information that the plaintiff's looking for without the  
20                  plaintiff's need to engage in a forensic review, unless they  
21                  choose to, at which point, you obviously can do whatever you  
22                  want, but if you're not going to direct that at this juncture  
23                  -- and I'm not going to require the plaintiffs formally  
24                  respond to your document requests and interrogatories until  
25                  you've had an opportunity to see their prior productions.

1                   MR. LICUL: Your Honor, may I just be heard just  
2 for two seconds on this?

3                   THE COURT: Yes.

4                   MR. LICUL: I understand the Court has made its  
5 ruling.

6                   I too am very familiar with Mr. Abramowitz's firm  
7 and I know the excellent work that they do but, again, I will  
8 just say this, if we were starting discovery now, I would --  
9 and they were not a party, I would serve a subpoena on them  
10 with the exact same requests. And so I don't see how --

11                  THE COURT: And they would respond by giving you  
12 the Attorney General's production and the Assembly production  
13 and that's what they're prepared to give you.

14                  What I think they don't want to do, and Mr.  
15 Abramowitz can correct me if I'm wrong, is reorganize all of  
16 the discovery so that it is responsive to your specific  
17 numerical requests because that will take a ton of work and  
18 probably take dozens and dozens of hours and those are the  
19 expenses that I suspect the clients are reluctant to incur  
20 unnecessarily.

21                  And guess what? If they don't have to, I don't  
22 think they should have to.

23                  I mean, Rule 1 of the Federal Rules of Civil  
24 Procedure encourages me to resolve disputes economically and  
25 efficiently for the parties and that's what I'm looking to do

1       here. I would like you to review the production before you  
2 conclude it's insufficient.

3                    MR. LICUL: Okay.

4                    MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Thank you, Your Honor.

5                    It's a shame the clients are not here to hear these  
6 very nice thing said about my firm.

7                    THE COURT: I don't recommend ordering the  
8 transcript.

9                    MS. GLAVIN: And I was going to say, Elkan, Mr.  
10 Abramowitz, I'm prepared to say nice things about your firm  
11 too and you.

12                  MR. ABRAMOWITZ: Okay. There you go.

13                  THE COURT: All right. So is there anything else I  
14 should take up on this issue? And then I'll just check in  
15 with all the parties.

16                  Mr. Licul, anything else on this issue?

17                  MR. LICUL: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

18                  THE COURT: Mr. Abramowitz?

19                  MR. ABRAMOWITZ: No, Your Honor. Thank you.

20                  THE COURT: Thank you.

21                  And I'm not ignoring you, Mr. Steele. Is there  
22 anything you'd like to raise or put on the record with regard  
23 to how discovery is going from the New York State Police's  
24 perspective?

25                  MR. STEELE: Not at this time, Your Honor. Thank

1 you.

2 THE COURT: And, Ms. Trzaskoma, anything for the  
3 Governor?

4 MS. TRZASKOMA: Yes, just briefly, we do, and it  
5 relates to the motion to stay, the forthcoming motion to  
6 stay.

7 We did serve a Rule 45 subpoena on the New York  
8 Attorney General's Office earlier last month. The time for  
9 responding has passed. We did get an objection from the  
10 Attorney General's Office arguing that the subpoena is  
11 premature. And the basis for that position is the potential,  
12 you know, is the stay motion and the pending motions to  
13 dismiss.

14 So we have a meet and confer with their office  
15 about the subpoena on Friday.

16 But given that they have indicated their belief  
17 that there is something about Mr. Azzopardi's and Ms.  
18 DeRosa's stay motion that affects their need to comply in a  
19 timely way with the subpoena we served, we would just want to  
20 clarify with Your Honor that consistent with the Court's  
21 prior orders, and consistent with what Your Honor has  
22 expressed today about discovery going forward, particularly  
23 on the harassment claims, which are not the subject of any  
24 motion, that discovery should proceed pace and that there's  
25 no basis given the forthcoming motion or the pending motions

1           to sort of slow down or not proceed expeditiously with that  
2 discovery.

3           THE COURT: But we will be entering a minute entry  
4 and order on the docket formally denying the -- I guess will  
5 be granting the motion for a pre-motion conference and then  
6 denying the request for a stay and we will articulate some  
7 detail in the minute entry and order.

8           And you're -- obviously it's a public filing,  
9 you're obviously free to share that with the Attorney  
10 General's Office and say that this stay motion was not  
11 granted.

12           The Court has directed the parties to begin the  
13 discovery process, albeit in a slightly limited way with  
14 regard to those two defendants only.

15           And, you know, to the extent that that advances  
16 your concerns in that forum, you're free obviously to share  
17 the minute entry and order that will be posted today.

18           MS. TRZASKOMA: Thank you very much. I appreciate  
19 that.

20           THE COURT: All right. Is there anything else from  
21 anyone? Just shout out who you represent. And if there's  
22 anything else to add to the record, feel free.

23           (No response)

24           THE COURT: All right. Well, thank you, all, for  
25 your time. Again, thank you for hopping on the conference on

1 short notice.

2 And as Mr. Abramowitz suggested, should the parties  
3 be unable to resolve kind of next steps in the negotiation on  
4 proceeding with discovery, you should feel free to file  
5 another joint letter and we'll get you on the calendar.

6 But I really hope that you're able to review that  
7 production and meet and confer to resolve any disputes and  
8 only come to the Court once you've done so.

9 Is that understood, everybody?

10 ALL COUNSEL: Yes, Your Honor.

11 THE COURT: Thank you. Thank you, all. Have a  
12 great day. And I hope you all stay safe.

13 ALL COUNSEL: Thank you, Your Honor.

14 THE COURT: Take care.

15 (Proceedings adjourned at 2:28 p.m.)

16 I, CHRISTINE FIORE, court-approved transcriber and  
17 certified electronic reporter and transcriber, certify that  
18 the foregoing is a correct transcript from the official  
19 electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-  
20 entitled matter.

21  
22 

23 \_\_\_\_\_ August 26, 2022

24 Christine Fiore, CERT

25 Transcriber